

Conflict of Interest

gets an offer of \$75,000 a year in the same line of work from a private business, are we going to blame him for accepting the position giving him \$30,000 or \$40,000 more a year? That seems normal to me. Let us not be that stupid and say: once you have been a minister, go and hide in the forest, and run away so no one will see you.

It seems to me that on that point one should use common sense in the same way as before being appointed a minister. However, let us set up standards, laws or regulations so that a minister will not be the prey of profiteers or large companies and become their stooge or puppet.

A minister of the Crown must be secure from any suspicion, as must be his officials and any other public servant. In today's *Le Devoir*, I think, there has been such a public servant unmasked in Quebec. It is very common in Quebec, we see that every day. Has Labour Minister Cournoyer been duped by a member of his staff, a man by the name of Morin? He is surely not a relative of the hon. member for Louis-Hébert (Mrs. Morin), but he is perhaps a relative of a member of the Parti Québécois, though. Apparently, according to calculation we made earlier, that man gets \$55,000 a year, including his \$23,000 salary. And he would get that for duping the minister, and without his paying any income tax! Mr. Speaker, those are conflicts of interest which should absolutely not be tolerated. We fully agree on that, we must take steps to prevent it.

As I was saying a moment ago, our financial system does nothing else but promote conflicts of interest. When anyone sponsors a bill in the Senate, does he not receive the visit of two or three company directors who come asking for his help for the passage of their bill. The Liberals receive such visitors all day long, and so do the Progressive Conservatives, the NDP and also the Social Crediters. If it is not Simpsons-Sears Limited, for an insurance company, it is Eaton's for another company. All companies act in this manner. Shall we refuse to help someone who is asking us for help? No, but let us not allow them to play tricks on us though. We are here to represent the people, and not the private interests of a group, a finance company or any other organization or union. I believe the most serious error made in Canada was to make the Rand formula compulsory. Very often workers are forced to pay dues to unions of which they are not members. We are told 30 per cent of the Canadian population is unionized. While 70 per cent are non-unionized, if half of the unionized 30 per cent are forced not only to join in and pay real dues, but on top of that contribute to NDP election funds, that is the end of it. And that group speaks on behalf of the unionized 30 per cent of the Canadian people.

I believe if we are to have adequate unions, if we are to prevent union representatives from running after us or trying to finance us under the table, we should tell them: Look after your own members, do your own recruiting and collecting, that is your job. They might then have less time to think of new strikes, overstrikes, support strikes, counterstrikes and every other kind of strike. They would have work to do, getting their own members, convincing them to join the union instead of forcing them to, as they would and actually do. We would then have healthy unions, respected membership, and member pride in their union.

[Mr. Caouette (Témiscamingue).]

As I have already said, Mr. Speaker, the little ones, the uninfluential ones get very little attention. This is also true in this House. We have here newspapermen, CBC people. You have to give a tip to have reaction, to get results or to go on the air, and especially with the three political parties. But as one might expect, this is the group that would change the system.

This morning, in my office, I had my television set on for an hour. What was there to see? The René Lévesque story? All the time Parizeau, René Lévesque, the whole collection of separatists with a couple of journalists. There appeared Gérard Godin, formerly of Quebec-Press, a defunct lowly paper in Quebec City that used to preach revolution, inviting everyone to revolt and have bloodshed. That was Radio-Canada's broadcast this morning at eleven o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, there are means of stopping this, but none still of stopping human beings from being human. We in Canada let those people say whatever they like. One of them was in France recently and he realized that there is less freedom in France than in Canada and the province of Quebec, really.

Let newspapermen go and write in France what they publish here in the province of Quebec and they will be behind bars before long. It was forbidden to write anything against de Gaulle when he was President of France. Even caricatures of him were strictly forbidden.

Here in Quebec, Ontario and the rest of the country, anyone is free to caricature us. We laugh because we know from whom the cartoons come from.

Mr. Speaker, the green paper will not prevent ministers from being ministers, members of parliament from being members of parliament and human beings from being human beings. To have regulations is a good thing; some will nonetheless evade them.

One day, when the Minister of Transport personally wrote to every large company in Canada asking them to replenish the election fund of the Liberal party, he was caught. What was that? He was begging the large companies to come and help them. We must recognize it, it was a kind of conflict of interest, not for him personally but for the party.

The Progressive Conservatives have done the same thing. We also write to people to get financial assistance. The NDP does not have to write so much, because it acts in collusion—not collision—with union leaders so they get money no matter what.

As for the green paper, we agree that we are going to consider it, but we are going to vote for the amendment put forward by the Leader of the Opposition to the effect that the parliamentary committee should be authorized to report on the green paper to learn its meaning and to make proper recommendations enabling us to do the necessary cleaning and prevent abuses noted in the past. This is why, Mr. Speaker, we support the motion introduced by the Leader of the Official Opposition.

• (1710)

Hon. Jeanne Sauvé (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, I would blame myself for not making any comments—although they will be off the cuff—on the